

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 26 to 29, all other claims having been cancelled.

Claims 26 to 29 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to the use of the term "suppressed".

Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection since it is believed that the present terminology wherein the term "suppressed" is replaced by the word "hydrogen". What was intended by the original meaning of Y_1 or Y_5 as being suppressed, it meant that they were not an amino acid but, rather, a hydrogen atom. Besides, this is the only possibility for the sequence to consist of 9 nucleotides. Therefore, the term "suppressed" has been replaced by the word "hydrogen".

Claims 26 to 29 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as having no basis for the exception clause and this rejection has been overcome by

the removal of the exception clause from claim 26 and new claim 33 is directed to the method. Claim 27 has been rewritten in independent form and claims 28 and 29 do not have the objected to terms therein. Therefore, they are free of this rejection.

Claims 26 to 28 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by the Croce et al patent because of the use of the open ended term. The term "consisting of" has now been used to replace the term "having" and therefore, this is believed to obviate this ground of rejection.

With respect to the rejection of claims 26 to 29 as being based upon a non-enabling disclosure under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, it is deemed that the claims are properly supported by the specification and to be based upon an enabling disclosure and that the written description is sufficient for the same. Therefore, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested particularly since the term "consisting of" has been used and the claim no longer has open language therein. The same is believed to be true for claim 29 which now uses the "consisting of" language. Therefore, withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly point out Applicants' patentable contribution and favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti



Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683
Attorney for Applicants
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds
Enclosures